arXiv:1511.07842v1 [math.NT] 24 Nov 2015

APPLICATIONS OF MARKOV CHAIN ANALYSIS TO INTEGER COMPLEXITY

CHRISTOPHER E. SHRIVER

Abstract. The complexity $f(n)$ of an integer was introduced in 1953 by Mahler & Popken: it is defined as the smallest number of 1's needed in conjunction with arbitrarily many $+$, $*$ and parentheses to write an integer n (for example $f(6) \leq 5$ since $6 = (1+1)(1+1+1)$). The best known bounds are

$$3\log_3 n \leq f(n) \leq 3.635 \log_3 n,$$

where the lower bound is due to Selfridge (with equality for powers of 3) while the upper bound was recently proven by Arias de Reyna & Van de Lune and holds for 'generic' integers n. We use Markov chain methods to develop an explicit algorithm that improves the upper bound to

$$f(n) \leq 3.529 \log_3 n \qquad \text{for 'generic' } n.$$

1. Introduction

What is the minimum number of 1's needed to write an integer n, using only $+$, $*$ and parentheses? In this paper we will denote by $f(n)$ the minimum number of ones needed to express n in this manner. For example, we have that $f(6) = 5$ since 6 can be written with five ones as $(1+1)(1+1+1)$, but not using four or fewer. Note that $f(11) \neq 2$; concatenation is not allowed. The problem dates back to a 1953 paper of Mahler & Popken [8]. Guy popularized the problem in his survey [5] and also included it in his book *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory* [6]. Recently, there has been renewed interest [1, 2, 3, 7, 4, 14] in the problem – the focus of our paper is on the asymptotic size of $f(n)$. An interesting expression for $f(n)$ given by Guy in [5] is

$$f(n) = \min_{\substack{d|n \\ 2\leq d\leq \sqrt{n} \\ 1\leq e\leq n/2}} \big\{ f(d) + f(n/d),\ f(e) + f(n-e) \big\},$$

which shows that the problem can be seen as arising from the difficulty of mixing additive and multiplicative behavior. Several initial results are given in Guy's article [5]. One of these, due to John Selfridge, is a lower bound of

$$f(n) \geq 3\log_3 n,$$

with equality exactly when n is a power of 3. As the author is not aware of any published proof of this fact, one is given below in Appendix A. Guy also describes several ways of obtaining an upper bound. A simple upper bound, resulting from expanding n in base 2 and using Horner's scheme, yields

$$f(n) \leq 3\log_2 n < 4.755 \log_3 n.$$

It seems difficult to get unconditional improvements since there exist numbers requiring an atypically large number of 1's to be represent, see for example (taken from [7])

$$f(1439) = 3.928 \log_3 (1439).$$

Much of the recent focus has been on improvements for subsets of density 1. Returning to Guy's original argument, we see that a 'typical' number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ should have roughly the same amount of 0's and 1's in its binary expansion, which suggests the upper bound

$$f(n) \approx \frac{5}{2} \log_2 n < 3.963 \log_3 n$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A67, 11B75, 60J10.
Key words and phrases. Integer complexity, Markov Chains.

in the 'generic' case (that is, numbers for which the proportion of 0's and 1's in the binary expansion is not too atypical). It is not difficult to show that the 'generic' case gives rise to a subset with density 1 on which the bound holds. Guy also cites an improvements by Isbell, the best of which is achieved by performing the same type of analysis in base 24 giving

$$f(n) < 3.817 \log_3 n$$

on a set of density 1. The currently best result is due to Arias de Reyna & Van de Lune [3] and is based on similar considerations carried out in base $b = 3359232$.

Theorem 1 (Arias de Reyna and Van de Lune, 2014)**.** *The set of natural numbers n for which*

$$f(n) \leq 3.635 \log_3 n \qquad \text{has density 1.}$$

Experimental results suggest that this can be improved: Iraids, Balodis, Čerņenoks, Opmanis, Opmanis, and Podnieks [4] have conjectured, based on extensive numerical computation, that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{\log_3 n} \leq 3.37.$$

We emphasize that while there are several other fascinating problems related to integer complexity, our focus will be on the asymptotic behavior. We refer to the bibliography for further details on other aspects of the problem.

2. Main results

2.1. **New upper bound.** Our main result will be to develop tools to analyze a class of algorithms generalizing the one used by Steinerberger [14]. The algorithm used in [14] is a refinement of the methods discussed above and consists of a simultaneous consideration of numbers in both base 2 and 3. More precisely, the algorithm proceeds as follows.

Algorithm (Greedy, base 6)**.**

(1) Take an arbitrary natural number n. If $n \leq 5$, use one of the optimal representations $1 = 1$, $2 = 1 + 1$, $3 = 1 + 1 + 1$, $4 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1$, or $5 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1$. Otherwise determine $n \pmod 6$ and move to step 2.
(2) Choose the best representation according to Table 2, depending on $n \pmod 6$:
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 0$, write as $3[n/3]$.
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 1$, write as $3\big[(n-1)/3\big] + 1$.
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 2$, write as $2[n/2]$.
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 3$, write as $3[n/3]$.
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 4$, write as $2[n/2]$.
   - If $n \pmod 6 \equiv 5$, write as $2\big[(n-1)/2\big] + 1$.

   Then apply step 2 to the result (the number in brackets) until one of the representations in step 1 can be applied.
(3) Replace every 2 by (1+1) and every 3 by (1+1+1).

An asymptotic analysis of the algorithm shows that

$$f(n) \leq 3.66 \log_3 n \qquad \text{for 'generic' } n.$$

This notion of 'generic' is measure-theoretic and weaker than that of a density one subsequence. We start by substantially improving the result using the same notion of 'generic' as in [14].

Theorem 2 (Main result)**.** *There exists a partition of $\mathbb{N}$ into sets $(A_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$ such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|A_k|} \Big| \big\{ n \in A_k : f(n) < 3.529 \log_3 n \big\} \Big| = 1.$$

The construction is based on a very fine analysis of Markov chains that allows us to study more effective algorithms of the type discussed above, answering an open problem stated in [14]. It seems very likely (and is further substantiated by numerical experiments) that the result actually holds for a set of density 1; we comment on this further below. The result is close to optimal with

regards to the methods that are being used and it seems that a significant further improvement would require substantially new ideas.
Table 1 shows the improvement of the new algorithm over the base 6 greedy algorithm and how well it fits the bound of Theorem 2 for a few arbitrarily chosen large numbers.

n	number of ones used to represent n by		$\lfloor 3.529 \log_3 n \rfloor$
	base 6 greedy	algorithm of Theorem 2	
$\lfloor \pi \cdot 10^{50} \rfloor + 10^{1000}$	7616	7386	7396
$\lfloor \sqrt{2} \cdot 10^{50} \rfloor + 10^{2000}$	15314	14732	14792
$\lfloor e \cdot 10^{50} \rfloor + 10^{3000}$	22893	22161	22189

TABLE 1. Comparison of performance of current and previous best known algorithms of the type considered in this paper.

2.2. **Universality.** We complement Theorem 2 by giving a detailed analysis of the sets A_k, which are defined to be the sets of natural numbers which the algorithm under consideration takes k steps to process, showing that their distribution is asymptotically log-normal. Our results are rather general and apply to the entire family of algorithms in this class.

Theorem 3 (Structure Theorem)**.** *The sets A_k have log-normal distribution: there exist constants c_1, c_2 such that*

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \log n - c_1 \sqrt{k} \ : \ n \in A_k \right\} \to \mathcal{N}(0, c_2)$$

in distribution as $k \to \infty$.

This statement guarantees that a typical element in $n \in A_k$ is roughly of size

$$n \sim e^{c_1 k + \mathcal{N}(0,c_2)\sqrt{k}}.$$

Stronger error bounds (i.e. large deviation inequalities) seem to be the key to showing that the result holds indeed for a subset of density 1. However, we consider this class of algorithms to be of independent interest. We note that similar structures appear in the definition of an *automatic sequence* (see e.g. [13]): the main difference is that in automatic sequence only the last step of the algorithm is kept while we are interested in the entire sequence (since we use that to create a way of representing n using only 1's). This could be an interesting direction for further research.

It is a simple consequence of this theorem that, for large enough k, $\frac{1}{k} \log n$ should be close to normally distributed with smaller and smaller variance, approaching a point distribution at c_1. Figure 1 shows that this is visible even for relatively small k.

2.3. **Limitations of these methods.** Our approach seems to fully exhaust the Markov chain method and substantial further improvements seem difficult; clearly, new ideas are needed. It seems worthwhile to note the following elementary fact pointing out that the only theoretical limit to the methods discussed above is of a computational nature.

> **Fact.** If, for some constant $3 \leq c < \infty$,
>
> $$\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{\log_3 n} \leq c$$
>
> then both Guy's basis method as well as the Markov chain method will be able to prove the upper bound $c + \varepsilon$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

This can be easily proven using an estimate of the type

$$\frac{1}{b} \sum_{n=1}^{b} f(n) \lesssim \frac{1}{b} \sum_{n=1}^{b} c \log_3 n \sim c \log_3 b$$



FIGURE 1. Distribution of $\frac{1}{38}\log n$ for random $n \in A_{38}$ (base 6 greedy algorithm).

to guarantee that a typical 'digit' in a base b representation requires at most $c\log_3 b$ times the digit 1's. At the same time, to represent an integer N, we need

$$\log_b N = \frac{\log N}{\log b} = \frac{\log_3 N}{\log_3 b} \qquad \text{digits in base } b$$

and therefore a total number of

$$\frac{\log_3 N}{\log_3 b} c\log_3 b = c\log_3 N \qquad \text{number of } 1's.$$

This implies that the Guy basis algorithm will eventually be effective. However, since the Markov chain algorithm is a generalization of the Guy basis algorithm, it will also be able to show the same bound, likely with less computational effort. Still, there is a limit to what is computationally feasible even with the generalized algorithms, and it seems that the current result is near this limit.

3. A Review of the Markov Chain Method

3.1. **Idea.** This section is primarily dedicated to an exposition of Steinerberger's approach, which did not receive a detailed explanation in the original paper. It is actually very similar to the method of proving Guy's upper bound of $4.755\log_3 n$ by writing

$$n = a_0 + (1+1)(a_1 + (1+1)(a_2 + (\cdots(1+1)(a_k + 1 + 1)\cdots)))$$

with $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$ (this is the expression of n in terms of its base 2 digits using Horner's scheme). An algorithmic description of Horner's scheme is as follows. Given a number n,

(1) If $n \leq 2$, use one of the optimal representations $1 = 1$, $2 = 1 + 1$. Otherwise move to step 2.
(2) Calculate $n \pmod 2$, then:
    - If $n \pmod 2 \equiv 0$, write as $2[n/2]$
    - If $n \pmod 2 \equiv 1$, write as $2[(n-1)/2] + 1$.

    Then repeat this step on the result (i.e. the number in brackets) until one of the representations in step 1 can be applied.
(3) Replace every 2 by (1+1).

Steinerberger's improvement was to look at the residue of n modulo 6, and depending on the residue divide by either 2 or 3. As an example, given a number of the form $6n+5$ one could write

$$6n + 5 = 1 + 2(3n + 2) = 1 + (1 + 1)(3n + 2)$$
$$6n + 5 = 2 + 3(2n + 1) = (1 + 1) + (1 + 1 + 1)(2n + 1).$$

The first method provides a number that is half the size of its input at the cost of 3 ones while the second approach gives a number that is a third of its input size at the cost of 5 ones. Clearly, we want to decrease the number by large factors as much as possible but at the same time we

want to avoid using more ones than necessary. We will now discuss a way of comparing those two situations to decide on which is favorable.

3.2. **Measuring inefficiency.** This section describes the heuristic used in [14]. We wish to emphasize that this heuristic will *not* always lead to optimal results (this answers a question posed at the end of [14]). Suppose that a step writes n as

$$n = \lambda \cdot \left[\frac{n-r}{\lambda}\right] + r$$

at a cost of m ones. Then the inefficiency is defined to be

$$I = m - 3\log_3 \lambda.$$

We remark that this quantity is never negative. Note that m is the number of ones it takes to write b and r, so

$$m = f(\lambda) + f(r) \geq f(\lambda) \geq 3\log_3 \lambda$$

and therefore

$$I \geq 0.$$

3.3. **The algorithm.** The algorithm given in [14] is now simply motivated by taking every residue class modulo 6, studying the inefficiency of the two representations arising from dividing by either 2 or 3 and then taking the representation with the smaller inefficiency. Explicit values for the inefficiency are given in Table 2. Choosing the option with the lowest efficiency for each step, we get the algorithm discussed above.

Local-global relations. It is natural to ask whether such a local greedy selection procedure can give rise to optimal algorithms. Fixing a greedy selection at every residue class gives rise to a unique global algorithm – the behavior of the global algorithm depends nonlinearly on local steps (i.e. greedy local steps may create an overall global dynamics that stays away from 'effective' residue classes). The question of whether optimal local steps necessarily imply optimal global steps was posed as an open problem in [14]. We will answer this question in the negative (see Section 5.2).

$n \mod 6$	divide by 2			divide by 3		
	representation	cost	inefficiency	representation	cost	inefficiency
0	$2\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$	2	0.107	$3\left(\frac{n}{3}\right)$	3	0
1	$2\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)+1$	3	1.107	$3\left(\frac{n-1}{3}\right)+1$	4	1
2	$2\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$	2	0.107	$3\left(\frac{n-2}{3}\right)+2$	5	2
3	$2\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)+1$	3	1.107	$3\left(\frac{n}{3}\right)$	3	0
4	$2\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$	2	0.107	$3\left(\frac{n-1}{3}\right)+1$	4	1
5	$2\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)+1$	3	1.107	$3\left(\frac{n-2}{3}\right)+2$	5	2

TABLE 2. Calculation of best options for each residue class mod 6

3.4. **Asymptotic analysis.** The key idea in the analysis of an algorithm of such a type is to interpret its large scale behavior as a markov chain. A Markov chain is a sequence of random variables $\mathbf{\Phi} = \{\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \Phi_2, \ldots\}$ on a measurable space X, such that the distribution of Φ_i is dependent only on the distribution of Φ_{i-1}. For our purposes, X will be finite and the dependence will be described by a matrix M via the relation

$$\pi_i = M\pi_{i-1}$$

where π_i is the vector giving the probability distribution of Φ_i (that is, $\pi_i(j)$ is the probability that $\Phi_i = j$). We denote by $P^m(x, A)$ the probability that x lands in the set A after m iterations:

$$P^m(x, A) := \mathbb{P}\big[\Phi_{i+m} \in A \mid \Phi_i = x\big].$$

To model the algorithm described above, we let $X = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ be the set of residues modulo 6. The transition matrix is constructed as follows: given an integer of the form $6n+1$, for example, the algorithm proceeds by writing

$$6n + 1 = 1 + (1 + 1 + 1)(2n).$$

A number of the form $2n$ has residue class $0, 2$ or 4 when re-interpreted modulo 6. This means that the state 1 can be followed by either 0, 2 or 4. A complete list of possible paths through states are represented by the directed graph in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. Directed graph representing the possible paths of the algorithm through residue classes mod 6.

The (i, j)th entry of the transition matrix is given by $M_{i,j} = P\big(i, \{j\}\big)$, the probability that one step of the algorithm sends a number congruent to i to a number congruent to j. Let us consider the same example again: suppose $n \equiv 1 \pmod 6$, and let $n = 6a + 1$. Then, following the algorithm, the next number we get is

$$(n - 1)/3 = 6a/3 = 2a.$$

With no further assumptions on n, it is equally likely that this is 0 (mod 6), 2 (mod 6), or 4 (mod 6). Therefore $M_{1,0} = M_{1,2} = M_{1,4} = \frac{1}{3}$. Similar calculations give the rest of the matrix:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that given an initial distribution π_0, we have

$$\pi_i = M^i \pi_0.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that M has an eigenvalue 1 of multiplicity 1. Therefore there is a unique probability distribution that is a 1-eigenvector, which is

$$\pi = \left(\frac{1}{13}, \frac{2}{13}, \frac{4}{13}, 0, \frac{3}{13}, \frac{3}{13} \right).$$

Since all other eigenvalues have absolute value strictly less than 1, it is easy to see that for any initial distribution π_0 we have

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} M^i \pi_0 = \pi.$$

The vector π is therefore called the *stationary* or *limit distribution* of $\mathbf{\Phi}$. Standard deviation inequalities then imply that the algorithm, when processing a 'typical' large number n will spend a proportion of time in each state that is roughly proportional to what is given by the limiting distribution. This, however, uniquely identifies the average rate of decay and the average number of times a digit 1 is being used.

4. Proof of Main Results

4.1. **A Central Limit Theorem.** We start by establishing a central limit theorem which allows us to control the average deviation of sample paths from the asymptotic limit.

Lemma (Markov Chain CLT)**.** *Let $\mathbf{\Phi}$ be a Markov chain on a finite space X. If there exists a state $i \in X$ and some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that i can be reached in exactly m steps from any starting point with positive probability, that is,*

$$P^m(x, i) > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in X,$$

then any starting distribution approaches the unique stationary distribution π at a geometric rate. Moreover, we have a central limit theorem: let $g : X \to \mathbb{R}$ and

$$S_n(g) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} g(\Phi_k).$$

Then if we let $\bar{g} = g - \mathbb{E}_\pi[g]$ where π is the limit distribution, there exists a constant $0 \le \gamma_g^2 < \infty$ such that for any initial condition $x \in X$ we have

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{S_n(\bar{g})}{\sqrt{n \gamma_g^2}} \le t \mid \Phi_0 = x \right] = \int_{-\infty}^{t} \frac{1}{2\pi} e^{-s^2/2} ds \qquad \text{whenever} \quad \gamma_g^2 > 0$$

and

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{S_n(\bar{g})}{\sqrt{n}} = 0 \qquad \text{whenever} \quad \gamma_g^2 = 0.$$

Proof. We prove this using results from Meyn and Tweedie [9]. An important concept is *uniform ergodicity*: we say that a Markov chain $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is uniformly ergodic if there exist $r > 1$ and $R < \infty$ such that for all x

$$\|P^n(x, \cdot) - \pi(\cdot)\| \le R r^{-n},$$

where π is the stationary distribution, interpreted as a measure on X (see [9, Theorem 16.0.2.]). Put differently, $P^n(x, \cdot)$ approaches $\pi(\cdot)$ geometrically. Here we define $\|\nu\|$ for a measure ν to be

$$\|\nu\| := \sup_{g \colon |g| \le 1} \left| \int g(x) \nu(dx) \right|.$$

Uniform ergodicity is a special case of what is called V-uniform ergodicity (see [9, Chapter 16]) such that V is a constant function. Theorem 17.5.4 in [9] implies that this is enough for a central limit theorem for $\mathbf{\Phi}$. So if we can establish uniform ergodicity we have geometric convergence to the limit distribution and convergence of $n^{-1/2} S_n(g)$ to a normal distribution (possibly with variance 0). The criterion we will use for showing ergodicity uses the notion of a small set (see

[9, Section 5.2.]). If ν is a measure on the state space X, a measurable set C is called *ν-small* if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $x \in X$ and all measurable sets B

$$P^m(x, B) \geq \nu(B).$$

Theorem 16.0.2 in [9] states that a Markov chain is uniformly ergodic if and only if X is ν-small for some ν. This is quite easy to show for our purposes: suppose that X is finite and some state $i \in X$ can be reached in exactly m steps from any starting point. Then let

$$l = \min_{x \in X} P^m(x, i) > 0$$

and define a measure

$$\nu(A) = \begin{cases} l, & i \in B \\ 0, & i \notin B \end{cases}.$$

Now if a set B does not contain i then its ν-measure is 0 and the condition is trivially satisfied. Otherwise,

$$P^m(x, B) \geq P^m(x, \{i\}) \geq l = \nu(B).$$

Therefore X is ν-small and the Markov chain is uniformly ergodic. □

4.2. **Applying the CLT.** We now use this to show that a class of algorithms generalizing the one in Section 3.3 can (with one additional condition) be used to prove strong concentration bounds for the outcome of the algorithm. First we introduce some notation.

We consider algorithms A defined by a map $\Lambda\colon \{0, 1, \ldots, a-1\} \to \mathbb{N}$ assigning dividing factors to residue classes such that $\Lambda(i) \mid a$ and $\Lambda(i) \geq 2$ for all $0 \leq i \leq a-1$, which produces a representation for a natural number n according to the following process:

> **General algorithm.** Define $n_0 = n$. Let $r_0 = n_0 \pmod a$, $\lambda_0 = \Lambda(r_0)$, and $s_0 = n_0 \pmod{\lambda_0}$. We then have
>
> $$n_0 = \lambda_0\big[(n_0 - s_0)/\lambda_0\big] + s_0.$$
>
> Iteratively define $n_{i+1} = (n_i - s_i)/\lambda_i$, and similarly λ_i and s_i as above, until we get to $n_k = 1$ for some k. Then we have the expression
>
> $$n = \lambda_0\big(\lambda_1\big(\lambda_2(\cdots(\lambda_{k-1} + s_{k-1})\cdots) + s_2\big) + s_1\big) + s_0$$
>
> and expressing the λ_i and s_i using their optimal representations gives a representation for n. (Note that $\lambda_i, s_i < a$ so only finitely many optimal representations must be known.)

We say that A is a base a algorithm, since it operates at each step on residue classes modulo a. If we write Λ as an a-tuple, Guy's algorithm would be represented as $(2, 2)$ and the one used by Steinerberger as $(3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2)$. A greedy algorithm can be produced for any base using the heuristic in Section 3.2 by choosing $\Lambda(i)$ for each i that gives the lowest inefficiency.

Given a base a algorithm A, let $\mathbf{\Phi} = \{\Phi_0, \Phi_1, \ldots\}$ be the resulting Markov chain on the space $X = \{0, 1, \ldots, a-1\}$ and M its transition matrix. If there is some state $i \in X$ which can be reached from any other in m steps, then from the above discussion there exists a unique stationary distribution which can be written as a vector $\pi \in [0, 1]^a$. Our goal is to bound $f(n)$ by estimating $f_A(n)$, the number of ones used by the algorithm A to represent n. We can estimate this by

$$f_A(n) = \bar{c} \cdot k,$$

where $\bar{c}$ is the average cost (that is, the average number of ones used per step) and k is the number of steps the algorithm takes, and estimating these factors in terms of n. If we let $\bar{\lambda} = n^{1/k}$, then

$$\frac{f_A(n)}{\log_3 n} = \frac{\bar{c}}{\log \bar{\lambda}} \log 3.$$

We will use the Markov chain central limit theorem (Lemma 4.1) to approximate $\bar{c}$ and $\log \bar{\lambda}$ assuming k to be large. The average cost $\bar{c}$ can be written as

$$\bar{c} = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} C(\Phi_i) = \frac{1}{k} S_k(C)$$

where $C(i)$ is the number of ones used by one step of the algorithm applied to $i \in X$, that is, the total number of ones needed to represent $\Lambda(i)$ and $i \pmod{\Lambda(i)}$ in their optimal forms. Clearly C is a bounded function, so we can apply Lemma 4.1. Thus

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} S_k(\bar{C}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} S_k(C - \mathbb{E}_\pi[C]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\big(S_k(C) - k \cdot \mathbb{E}_\pi(C)\big)$$

approaches a normal distribution with finite (possibly zero) variance, so

$$\frac{1}{k} S_k(\bar{C}) = \frac{1}{k}\big(S_k(C) - k \cdot \mathbb{E}_\pi[C]\big) = \bar{c} - \mathbb{E}_\pi[C]$$

approaches a delta distribution at 0. This means that for large enough k, the distribution of $\bar{c}$ is clustered arbitrarily tightly around $\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]$: given any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ there exists K such that for all $k \geq K$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\big|\bar{c} - \mathbb{E}_\pi[C]\big| > \delta \;\Big|\; n \in A_k\Big] < \varepsilon.$$

A similar approach gives an estimate of $\log \bar{\lambda}$ in terms of n. We can write n as

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \lambda_0\big(\lambda_1\big(\lambda_2(\cdots(\lambda_{k-1} + s_{k-1})\cdots) + s_2\big) + s_1\big) + s_0 \\ &= \lambda_0\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1} + \lambda_0\cdots\lambda_{k-2}s_{k-1} + \ldots + \lambda_0\lambda_1 s_2 + \lambda_0 s_1 + s_0 \\ &= \lambda_0\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}\left(1 + \frac{s_{k-1}}{\lambda_{k-1}} + \ldots + \frac{s_2}{\lambda_2\cdots\lambda_{k-1}} + \frac{s_1}{\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}} + \frac{s_0}{\lambda_0\cdots\lambda_{k-1}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Then of course

$$n \geq \lambda_0\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1},$$

and since $\lambda_i \geq 2$ and $s_i \leq a - 1$

$$n \leq \lambda_0\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}\left(1 + \frac{a-1}{2} + \frac{a-1}{2^2} + \ldots + \frac{a-1}{2^k}\right) < \lambda_0\lambda_1\cdots\lambda_{k-1}\cdot a.$$

Taking logarithms and dividing by k, the last two inequalities combined give

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\lambda_i \leq \frac{1}{k}\log n \leq \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\lambda_i + \frac{1}{k}\log a. \tag{1}$$

Therefore since $\log\bar{\lambda} = \frac{1}{k}\log n$, for large enough k

$$\log\bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\lambda_i$$

can be made arbitrarily small for all $n \in A_k$.
But $\lambda_i = \Lambda(\Phi_i)$, so

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\lambda_i = \frac{1}{k} S_k(\log\Lambda).$$

Just as before, Λ is a bounded function on X so

$$\frac{1}{k} S_k(\overline{\log\Lambda}) = \frac{1}{k} S_k(\log\Lambda) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\log\Lambda]$$

approaches a delta distribution at 0. Thus for any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ there exists K so that for $k \geq K$

$$\big|\log\bar{\lambda} - \frac{1}{k} S_k(\log\Lambda)\big| < \frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{for all } n \in A_k$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\Big|\frac{1}{k}S_k(\log\Lambda) - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\log\Lambda]\Big| > \frac{\delta}{2}\Big] < \varepsilon,$$

so

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\big|\log\bar{\lambda} - \mathbb{E}_\pi[\log\Lambda]\big| > \delta \;\Big|\; n \in A_k\Big] < \varepsilon.$$

Recalling that $\frac{f_A(n)}{\log_3 n} = \frac{\bar{c}}{\log_3 \bar{\lambda}}$, it follows that for any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ there exists K such that for $k \geq K$,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\Big|\frac{f_A(n)}{\log_3 n} - \frac{\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]}{\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log_3\Lambda]}\Big| > \delta \;\Big|\; n \in A_k\Big] < \varepsilon.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[f_A(n) > \Big(\frac{\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]}{\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log_3\Lambda]} + \delta\Big)\log_3 n \;\Big|\; n \in A_k\Big] < \varepsilon.$$

Since $f(n) \leq f_A(n)$, we now have that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|A_k|}\left|\Big\{n \in A_k \;:\; f(n) > \Big(\frac{\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]}{\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log_3\Lambda]} + \delta\Big)\log_3 n\Big\}\right| = 0.$$

So given an algorithm A such that some state is accessible from any other in precisely m steps (for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$) we can calculate π, $\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]$, and $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log_3\Lambda]$ to get an upper bound for $f(n)$.

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 3.** From Equation 1 above, for all $n \in A_k$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}S_k(\log\Lambda) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\log n \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}S_k(\log\Lambda) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\log a.$$

So as k approaches infinity, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\log n$ approaches $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}S_k(\log\Lambda)$ in distribution, which we know approaches a normal distribution with mean $\sqrt{k}\cdot\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log\Lambda]$. From this it follows that $\frac{1}{k}\log n$ approaches a point distribution at $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log\Lambda]$.
This convergence is already visible for relatively small k. A histogram for a random selection of numbers in A_{38}, where A is the greedy algorithm in base 6, is shown in Figure 1.

5. Proof of Theorem 2

5.1. **Greedy algorithm in higher basis.** The most obvious new class of algorithms to consider is greedy algorithms for higher bases. For example, the greedy algorithm in base 30 can be succinctly written as

$$\Lambda = (3,3,2,3,2,5,3,3,2,3,\ 2,2,3,3,2,3,2,2,3,3,\ 2,3,2,2,3,5,2,3,2,2),$$

giving rise to a transition matrix

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccc}
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \cdot & \frac{1}{2} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\
\cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \frac{1}{5} & \cdot & \frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2}
\end{array}\right).$$

It is quite easy to derive a numerical approximation of the stationary distribution as

$$\begin{aligned}\pi = (&0.01605, 0.03211, 0.03913, 0, 0.03929, 0.06272, 0.01272, 0.04573, 0.03753, 0, 0.05072, 0.05584,\\ &0.01948, 0.04210, 0.06637, 0, 0.03228, 0.02909, 0.00684, 0.03131, 0.06934, 0, 0.05267, 0.04013,\\ &0.02053, 0.04721, 0.05912, 0, 0.03640, 0.05529)^T.\end{aligned}$$

Using the transition matrix it can be checked that any nontransient state can be reached from any other state in exactly 9 steps, so that our Central Limit Theorem applies. From this algorithm we get the improved result that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|A_k|}\big|\{n \in A_k : f(n) \le 3.59 \log n\}\big| = 1,$$

where A_k is the set of numbers which the base 30 greedy algorithm takes k steps to process.

5.2. **Improving on the greedy algorithm.** It is possible to improve on the greedy algorithm (this was not clear a priori). We define a 'landscape' of algorithms by associating to each algorithm A of the type above a cost

$$c_A = \frac{\mathbb{E}_\pi[C]}{\mathbb{E}_\pi[\log_3 \Lambda]}$$

and saying that two algorithms A_1, A_2 are adjacent if their tuples Λ_1, Λ_2 agree on all but exactly one entry. The problem of finding a better bound is now a nonlinear optimization problem on a large search space. The best known algorithm was found using simulated annealing. It has base $2\cdot3\cdot5\cdot7\cdot11 = 2310$ and constant $c \approx 3.5286$. The corresponding 2310-tuple Λ is given in Appendix B. This algorithm implies the result

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|A_k|}\Big|\big\{n \in A_k : f(n) > 3.529 \log n\big\}\Big| = 0.$$

In comparison, the greedy algorithm for base 2310 gives a constant of 3.561. The improvement can be seen to come in part from the increased frequency with which 3 is used as a dividing factor, as shown in Table 3. Note in particular that one way the greedy algorithm accomplishes this is by using 11 as a dividing factor one in every fifty steps, even though it is never locally optimal (as can be seen from the center column). By taking a few locally inefficient steps, the algorithm is able to use 3 in ten percent more steps.

factor	frequency of use		
	base 6 greedy	base 2310 greedy	base 2310 improved
2	0.769	0.628	0.507
3	0.231	0.213	0.352
4	·	·	·
5	·	0.102	0.063
6	0	0	0
7	·	0.058	0.057
8	·	·	·
9	·	·	·
10	·	0	0
11	·	0	0.021

TABLE 3. Comparison of frequency of factors used by improved algorithm with greedy algorithms. The frequency is the proportion of states which use a given factor, weighted by the limit distribution. Dots represent factors not allowed given the base.

6. Concluding Remarks

6.1. **Extendability.** Using higher bases and running simulated annealing for more iterations will produce slightly better bounds. The bound produced by an algorithm is limited by the complexity of its dividing factors, and since most small numbers have suboptimal complexity (that is, $f(n)/\log_3 n$ is well above 3), very good algorithms will have to include large dividing factors. But large factors will be used infrequently by an optimized algorithm, since dividing out by any factor is only worth it if the number of ones it costs to remove the remainder is small. This happens infrequently for large numbers, so including a single large factor, no matter how efficient it is by itself, will not have much of an effect on the resulting bound. While, computationally, this method will always be able to produce better results than Guy's basis method (since Guy's basis method can actually be implemented as a special case), it is at this point not clear to us how one would most effectively optimize over the class of algorithms. We consider this to be a fascinating problem.

6.2. **Density 1 Subset.** It would also be interesting to strengthen Theorem 2 to state that $f(n) < 3.53 \log_3 n$ for a set of integers of density 1, with the same holding for all bounds produced by the same type of algorithm. The key difficulty seems to be as follows: the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ for N large can be written

$$\{1, 2, \ldots, N\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\ell} A_k \cup \bigcup_{k=\ell+1}^{\infty} \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \cap A_k.$$

The first half is easily controlled since we know that only a small proportion of elements in A_k ($k \leq \ell$) can violate the bound. However, the second part is much more difficult to control because while we do have fairly explicit control on every single set A_k ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) and know the number of explicit violations to the bound to be small, we have not yet established sufficient control on $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \cap A_k$ to draw any conclusions. The missing element in establishing the desired bound for a subset of density 1 is a statement guaranteeing that the number of 'bad' elements in $\{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \cap A_k$ is not disproportinately larger than the proportion of 'bad' elements in A_k. Numerical experiments strongly hint at this being the case.

6.3. **Brownian motion.** This comment is inspired by work of Sinai on large-scale properties of the $3x + 1$ problem. Define $T : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ via

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} n/2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \\ \frac{3n+1}{2} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The $3x+1$ problem asks whether for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is some k such that repeated iteration yields $T^{(k)}(n) = 1$. If one were to assume that being even or odd is equally likely for numbers arising in the course of these iterations, then one would expect an average decay of

$$T^{(k)}(n) \sim \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} n \quad \text{and that} \quad T^{(k)}(n) \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\frac{k}{2}} \quad \text{appears to be random on a logarithmic scale.}$$

Some rigorous results in that direction have been obtained by Sinai [10, 11, 12]. Since our class of algorithms is related to the $3x+1$ problem (the only but admittedly crucial difference being that our algorithms always decrease the input), we were motivated to see whether similar phenomena appear. Indeed, it seems that a suitable rescaled series of numbers behaves like Brownian motion on a logarithmic scale (see Figure 3). We consider this to be a promising direction for further research.



FIGURE 3. $\log\left(x_i \bar{\lambda}^i\right)$ using the base 6 greedy algorithm for a random element in A_{1496} (left) and one in A_{2944} (right).

Acknowledgements The author gratefully acknowledges access to the OMEGA cluster of the Yale University High Performance Computing Center.

REFERENCES

[1] H. Altman, Integer complexity and well-ordering. Michigan Math. J. 64 (2015), no. 3, 509-538.
[2] H. Altman, J. Zelinsky, Numbers with integer complexity close to the lower bound. Integers 12 (2012), no. 6, 1093-1125.
[3] J. Arias de Reyna and J. van de Lune, Algorithms for determining integer complexity. arXiv:1404.2183v2
[4] J. Čerņenoks, J. Iraids, M. Opmanis, R. Opmanis, and K. Podnieks, Integer Complexity: Experimental and Analytical Results II. arxiv:1409.0446v1
[5] R. K. Guy, Unsolved Problems: Some Suspiciously Simple Sequences. Amer. Math. Monthly 93 (1986), no. 3, 186–190.
[6] R. K. Guy, Unsolved Problems in Number Theory, 3^{rd} edition, Springer, 2004.
[7] J. Iraids, K. Balodis, J. Čerņenoks, M. Opmanis, R. Opmanis, and K. Podnieks, Integer Complexity: Experimental and Analytical Results. arXiv:1203.6462
[8] K. Mahler and J. Popken, On a maximum problem in arithmetic. (Dutch) Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde (3) 1, (1953). 1–15.
[9] S.P. Meyn and R.L. Tweedie, Markov chains and stochastic stability. Springer-Verlag, London (1993). Available at: probability.ca/MT
[10] Ya. Sinai, Statistical $(3x+1)$ problem. Dedicated to the memory of Jrgen K. Moser. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 56 (2003), no. 7, 1016-1028.
[11] Ya. Sinai, Uniform distribution in the $(3x+1)$-problem. Mosc. Math. J. 3 (2003), no. 4, 1429-1440.
[12] Ya. Sinai, A theorem about uniform distribution. Comm. Math. Phys. 252 (2004), no. 1-3, 581-588.
[13] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit, Automatic sequences. Theory, applications, generalizations. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
[14] S. Steinerberger, A Short Note on Integer Complexity. Contributions to Discrete Mathematics 9 (2014), 63–69.

Appendix A. Proof of Selfridge's lower bound

Here we give a prove of a result mentioned in [5] and attributed to John Selfridge because we were unable to find it in the literature and consider it worthwhile to have it written. However, we also note that very similar (and more advanced) types of argument along the same lines also appear in a paper by Altman & Zelinsky [2].

Theorem (Selfridge)**.** *We have*

$$f(n) \geq 3 \log_3 n,$$

with equality exactly when n is a power of 3.

Proof. We use induction: suppose the bound holds for all numbers less than n. Use the formula

$$f(n) = \min\{f(a) + f(b) \ : \ a, b < n \text{ such that } ab = n \text{ or } a + b = n\}.$$

First consider the case where a or b is 1; assume without loss of generality that $a = 1$. Then

$$f(a) + f(b) = f(1) + f(n-1) \geq 1 + 3 \log_3(n-1).$$

A straightforward calculation shows that this is greater than $3 \log_3 n$ for $n \geq 4$.
The other case is where $a, b \geq 2$. Then

$$f(a) + f(b) \geq 3 \log_3 a + 3 \log_3 b = 3 \log_3 ab.$$

If $ab = n$ then this satisfies the desired bound. Otherwise, suppose without loss of generality that $a \leq b$. Then

$$ab \geq 2b \geq a + b$$

so

$$3 \log_3 ab \geq 3 \log_3(a + b) = 3 \log_3 n.$$

The two cases considered together give a proof for $n \geq 4$; the remaining cases are easy to check. □

Appendix B. Best known algorithm

The following is the 2310-tuple representation of the current best known algorithm, which was used to prove Theorem 2.

```
(3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 7, 3, 2, 7, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 7,
 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11,
 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 7, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 7, 7,
 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2,
11, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 7, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 11, 2, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 3, 2, 3, 7, 5, 2, 2, 5, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 11, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 11, 2, 3, 3, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2, 7, 3, 3, 5, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 7, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3,
 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
 2, 3, 5, 3, 11, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 11, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 11, 3, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 2, 2, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 11, 5, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 11, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 11,
```

2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 3, 11, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 7, 2, 3, 11, 5, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 3, 7, 2, 11, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 5, 2, 3, 5, 3, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 5, 7, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 11, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 11, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11, 11, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 7, 5, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
3, 3, 7, 3, 7, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11,
7, 2, 2, 3, 7, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 7, 5, 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 7, 2, 3, 11, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 11, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 7,
11, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 7, 2, 3, 3, 11, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2,
2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 5, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7,
2, 2, 7, 3, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 11,
2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 11, 3, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 7, 3, 5, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11, 7, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 5, 2, 2, 7, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 2,
11, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 11, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 7, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 11, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 11, 11, 7, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7,
3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 5, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 7, 7, 7,
2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 5, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 11,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 11, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 3, 11, 2, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 2, 2,
2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 5, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 7, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7,
2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 5, 2, 7, 2, 2,
5, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 7, 3, 7, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 5, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2,
11, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 11, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 2, 7, 3, 11, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 2, 11, 2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7,
3, 2, 5, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 2, 11, 3, 5, 5, 11, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 7, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 7, 7, 2, 3, 2, 11,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 11,
3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 5, 3, 11, 3, 2, 2, 3, 7, 2, 3, 3, 3, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2,
2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 3, 2, 5, 2, 2, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 11, 7, 2, 3, 2, 2,
3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 7, 7, 7, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2)

Branford College, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520
E-mail address: christopher.shriver@yale.edu